curious
ECOLOGISTS

Curious Ecologists
Ecological Consultants
156, Meadow Lane
Coalville
LE67 4DP
Tel. 01530 457440
curiousecologists@yahoo.co.uk

Biodiversity Report for

10 Main Street, Orton on the Hill, Leicestershire
Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 30th May 2011

Proprietors

Bern Gibney (Ecologist) – 07875 484342 (mob)
Karen Headley (Ecologist) – 07913 873904 (mob)
Martin Randall (Woodland and Arboricultural Consultant) – 07968 297893 (mob)

Protected Species Survey at 10 Main Street, Orton on the Hill

Name of Client: D. Richardson

Name of Agent: Pick Everard, contact- Rickesh Parmer

Address of Agent: Halford House, Charles Street, Leicester, LE1 1HA

Date of Survey: 30th May 2011

Weather Conditions: 100% cloud, breezy, cool, 8^0C

Address of survey site: 10 Main Street, Orton on the Hill, nr Atherstone, Warwickshire, CV9 3NN

Planning Application Number:

Grid Reference of survey site: SK 5748 4145

Name of Surveyor: A.B.Gibney BSc (Hons), MIEEM

Licence Numbers: Great Crested Newt 20103624, Bat 20103625 & Barn Owl 20103623 issued by Natural England

1) Background

1.1 Reason for survey

It is proposed to extend the existing house and outbuildings, which includes demolishing the existing garage and altering the roofs. A protected species (particularly bats) survey was requested as part of the Planning Permission to carry on the development.

1.2 Description of site

The site was in a village setting, and consisted of a detached dwelling and attached garage, surrounded by a garden. The garden was a mix of hardstanding (tarmac and slabs), herbaceous/shrub planting and mown lawn (amenity grass mix). There were some trees in the vicinity (nearest about 5m); none are affected by the proposals. There were no garden ponds on the site, and there did not appear to be any field ponds within 100m of the proposed development. There was no vegetation within the area of the proposed works, other than closely mown lawn.
The surrounding area consisted of residential properties.

1.3 The Building

The building was detached, two-storey, with attached single-storey sections and garage. The building had brick walls and a tile roof (flat clay/composite tiles).
The main roof was in sections, at more than one height, with equal pitches on the pitched roofs and gables to these sections. Another section was single storey with a flat roof, with a tarred felt covering. There were wooden fascias on this section, but there were no gaps between the walls and the fascias. Timber purlins and rafters supported the main roofs and the tiles had roof felt backing. There were loft spaces, which were fully accessible for survey. They were insulated, and the insulation was pushed into the eaves. There were no missing tiles and no gaps between or under the tiles, as these were covered in moss, which sealed any potential gaps. The loft was full of spiders' webs, particularly on the ridge boards and between the rafters.



Photo 1: Spiders webs on roof timbers

The ridge tiles were all in place, and there were no gaps under or between them. All the windows and doors (wooden frames) were tightly fitted with no cavities or gaps that would allow access for bats. The lead flashing around the chimney was tightly fitting, and there were no cavities.
There were wooden soffits and fascias supporting the guttering on the main roof. There were no gaps between the wall and the soffits. The eaves were covered in spiders' webs. The ventilation gaps were covered in wire mesh.



Photo 2: single-storey attached garage

The single storey attached garage had brick walls and a tile roof (flat clay/composite tiles).
The main roof was at one height, with equal pitches and a gable. Timber purlins and rafters supported the main roofs and the tiles had roof felt backing. There was a loft space, which was fully accessible for survey.
There were no missing tiles and no gaps between or under the tiles, as these were covered in moss, which sealed any potential gaps.
The loft was full of spiders' webs, particularly on the ridge boards and between the rafters.
The ridge tiles were all in place, and there were no gaps under or between them. All the windows and doors (wooden frames) were tightly fitted with no cavities or gaps that would allow access for bats. There were wooden soffits and fascias supporting the guttering on the main roof. There were no gaps between the wall and the soffits. The eaves were covered in spiders' webs. The ventilation gaps were covered in wire mesh.



Photo 3: Rear view of house

2) Survey Methods

The buildings were searched in a systematic pattern, all available spaces were searched, looking for signs of bats, in particular droppings, insect remains (where bats have fed), lack of spiders' webs (where bats have roosted), the bats themselves and body oils stains (where bats have squeezed through gaps). Particular attention was paid to undisturbed surfaces, walls (where bat droppings sometimes stick) and window sills (both inside and outside the buildings). The search was carried out with a high power torch inside the building and binoculars on the outside (particularly searching under eaves and ridge tiles). All cavities were checked using an endoscope to establish if anything was within them. Bats would be active at the time of year that the survey was undertaken, and a bat detector was on at all times, in case light from the torch disturbed bats.

Signs of birds were also noted, particularly old nests. Birds would be nesting at the time of year that the survey took place.

The ground was searched for tracks, trails or signs (particularly droppings and food/feeding signs) of protected species.

3) Results

3.1 Bats – There was no evidence of bats found during the survey, there were no droppings or other signs, all surfaces and cavities were covered in spiders' webs. There were no access points for bats to gain entry into the roof as far as could be ascertained.

3.2 Birds – There were no old nests found on or in the building. There was no vegetation in the garden suitable for birds to nest in, which may be affected by the proposals.

3.3 There was no evidence of any other protected species on the site, and there did not appear to be any habitat suitable for other protected species.

4) Conclusions

4.1 The building had not been used by bats as roost sites.

4.2 The building had not been used for birds to nest, and there were no old nests on or in the buildings. Plus there was no vegetation in the garden, which would provide suitable nest sites for birds, which may be affected by the proposals.

4.3 There were no indications of any other protected species on the site.

5) Recommendations and Mitigations

- The proposed development is unlikely to have a negative effect on the biodiversity of the area, as it will only affect an area, which would be classed as of limited wildlife value, i.e. yard/garden and buildings being the habitats present. (England Field Unit 2007).

- Also no evidence of a bat roost was found during the survey, and so there are no further recommendations.

References and Bibliography

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. & McLeish, A.P. [ed.] (1999) *The Bat Workers' Manual* JNCC

K.Parsons (ed.) (2007) *Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines* Bat Conservation Trust

Hill, D., Fasham, M., Tucker, G., Shewry, M. & Shaw, P. (Eds) (2006) *Handbook of Biodiversity Methods: Survey, Evaluation & Monitoring* Cambridge

England Field Unit (2007) *Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey – a technique for environmental audit* JNCC

Report Produced by

Alan Bernard Gibney BSc (Hons), MIEEM - Ecologist (Curious Ecologists)